

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is, in my view, a frightening example of how media corporations can use their ownership of television stations to influence what the public is allowed to see, according to their own (in this case, right-wing) political views. My understanding is that the owner of SBC is even calling a highly biased anti-Kerry political film "news coverage".

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy.

It has been in the "news" (on the internet, I don't even bother with television news anymore because the programming has become so shoddy) says the FCC will not intervene in the case of the provocatively titled anti-Kerry film "Stolen Honor: Wounds That Never Heal", even though campaign regulations require that equal air time to each side in an election. How exactly can anyone claim that a film with a title such as that is favorable or neutral towards the candidate (Kerry)?

I propose that if you allow this film to be shown, nay, force-fed to viewers of public television, you also require that Sinclair show, oh, perhaps Fahrenheit 9/11, immediately afterwards. Then you would have "fair and balanced" coverage of election issues.

This really is a disgrace, and I urge you, as regulators, to change your position on this matter.

By the way, I have nearly stopped watching television entirely, because I feel it is insufficiently regulated in a number of ways. These are:

- 1) horrendously biased news coverage (near propaganda during the Iraq war)
- 2) too much sex and violence
- 3) shows promoting dubious moral values (weakest link, temptation island, plastic surgery makeovers, etc)
- 4) too many advertisements that are too loud
- 5) direct advertising to children of products that are not good for them, mainly junk food and violent toys.

The anti-Kerry film, in my view, falls into the first category, but also presents an entirely different problem: that of private-sector manipulation of allegedly public airways.